



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/803,140	03/17/2004	Kyle Gene Brown	RSW920030303US1	7118
36736	7590	06/10/2008		
DUKE W. YEE				
YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.				
P.O. BOX 802333				
DALLAS, TX 75380				
EXAMINER				
WILLIAMS, CLAYTON R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2157				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/10/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/803,140

Applicant(s)

BROWN ET AL.

Examiner

Clayton R. Williams

Art Unit

2157

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 5-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 5-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 2 and 5-17 are pending in this application, of which claims 1, 2, 5 and 13-15 are amended per Feb. 27, 2008 amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 2, 7-10, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Robinson et al., US 2004/0128345.

For claim 1, Robinson discloses a method in a data processing system to identify a Web service in a registry using a registry lookup naming and directory provider, the method comprising steps of:

detecting a request from a service requester to identify the Web service in the registry;

responsive to detecting the request, determining if a first element is present in a registry file;

responsive to determining the first element is present in the registry file, locating a second element in the registry file based on the first element in the registry file;

locating an endpoint location of the Web service based on the second element in the registry file;

retrieving an instance of the Web service based on the endpoint location; and

returning the instance of the Web service to the service requester ([0026], disclosure of UDDI registry wherein a client may request a service and a registry performs query and returns result to client and [0042], specific disclosure of web services being offered in system).

For claim 2, Robinson discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising in response to determining the first element is absent from the registry file, deferring identification of the Web service to a standard naming and directory provider, wherein deferring identification of the Web service includes passing the request to the standard naming and directory provider, and wherein identification of the Web service by the standard naming and directory provider further comprises:

locating an additional configuration file;

determining if a service name element is present in the additional configuration file; and

responsive to determining the service name element exists is present in the additional configuration file, locating an endpoint location of the Web service based on an address element of the additional configuration file ([0026], disclosure of web services registry forwarding client request to another registry in event query of first registry is unsuccessful).

For claim 7, Robinson discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the request includes a parameter representing a name of the Web service ([0026], disclosure of querying for named services).

For claim 8, Robinson discloses the method of claim 7, wherein determining if a first element is present in the registry file includes determining if the name of the Web service maps to the first element ([0026], disclosure that UDDI database queried against request for named services).

For claim 9, Robinson discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the first element includes a service-ref-name element ([0026], service-ref-name is analogous to name of service requested).

For claim 10, Robinson discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the registry file includes one of a UDDI registry file, an electronic business using extensible markup

language registry file, a web service inspection language registry file, and a custom registry file implemented using a database ([0026]).

For claim 13, Robinson discloses the method of claim 2, wherein locating an additional configuration file includes locating a wsdl-file element in a webservicessclient.xml file ([0026], disclosure of web services registry forwarding client request to another registry in event query of first registry is unsuccessful; furthermore, WSDL, as noted above in claim 5 rejection, is common descriptor language for registries).

For claim 14, Robinson discloses the method of claim 2, wherein determining if a service name element is present in the additional configuration file includes determining if a name of the Web service from the request maps to the service name element ([0026], disclosure that UDDI database queried against request for named services)..

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 5 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson, in view of Official Notice.

For claim 5, Robinson does not explicitly disclose wherein the additional configuration file includes a web service directory language file.

However, Examiner takes Official Notice that UDDI registries are XML based. Furthermore, WSDL, an XML-based descriptor language, is commonly used to store information in UDDI registries.

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the claimed invention to have utilized WSDL encoding because it is a common, if not de facto, encoding standard for storing information within UDDI registries.

For claim 15, Robinson fails to explicitly disclose wherein identification of the Web service by the standard naming and directory service, further comprising:

responsive to determining the service name element is absent from the additional configuration file, returning an error to the service requester.

However, Examiner takes Official Notice that Web services registries return "error" messages in event a web query returns zero results.

6. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson, in view of Stelting, US 20040030740 (hereinafter Stelting).

For claim 6, Robinson fails to explicitly disclose wherein the request includes a Java naming and directory interface request.

However, Stelting discloses a method that discovers web services by querying a JNDI registry [0028]. Robinson and Stelting are analogous art because both are from the field of web services querying.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Robinson with those of Stelting, because this modification extends the querying method of Robinson to include JNDI functionality.

7. Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson, in view of Nykanen, US 7155425 (hereinafter Nykanen).

For claim 11, Robinson fails to explicitly disclose wherein the endpoint location of the Web service includes a universal resource locator.

However, Nykanen discloses a web services registry returning a URL to a requesting client (col. 2, lines 49-59). Robinson and Nykanen are analogous art because both are from the field of web services querying.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Robinson with those of Nykanen, because this modification

extends the querying method of Robinson to include the return of a URL to a requesting client.

For claim 12, the combination of Robinson and Nykanen discloses the method of claim 1, wherein instance of the Web service includes a stub of implementation of the Web service (col. 2, lines 49-59, stub returned to client after client directs itself to provided URL).

8. Claims 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson, in view of Moore et al., US 20040122926 (hereinafter Moore).

For claim 16, Robinson fails to explicitly disclose wherein locating an endpoint location of the Web service based on the second element in the registry file includes determining if a lookup policy element exists in the registry file, wherein the lookup policy element includes a selection policy element.

However, Moore discloses a web services registry which selects web services to provide to a requesting clients based on associated reputation and contractual information ([0034], disclosure that returned results for query ranked; [0054], disclosure of registry only returning one result to requesting client). Robinson and Moore are analogous art because both are from the field of web services querying.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Robinson with those of Moore, because this modification extends the querying method of Robinson to include returning a "best" result when multiple matches for a query exist.

For claim 17, the combination of Robinson and Moore discloses:

The method of claim 16, wherein the registry lookup naming and directory provider selects a single endpoint location from a plurality of endpoint locations based on a selection policy in the selection policy element ([0034], disclosure that returned results for query ranked; [0054], disclosure of registry only returning one result to requesting client).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, filed Feb. 27, 2008, have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the prior rejections have been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, new grounds of rejections have been made.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Clayton R. Williams whose telephone number is 571-270-3801. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8 a.m. - 5 p.m.).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jun. 6, 2008
CRW

Clayton R. Williams
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2157

Art Unit: 2157

/Ario Etienne/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2157